

MINUTES
CITY COUNCIL MEETING – COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
NOVEMBER 5, 2007

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 5, 2007, in the Council Chambers of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU and SKALA were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 15, 2007 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Crayton and a second by Ms. Nauser.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Watkins explained staff was requesting B381-07 relating to the construction of Fire Station No. 7 be added to the agenda under the Introduction and First Reading section.

The agenda, including the Consent Agenda and the addition of B381-07 to the Introduction and First Reading section, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Hoppe and a second by Mr. Skala.

SPECIAL ITEMS

Fire Department - Life Saving Award Presentations.

Chief Markgraf noted the Columbia Fire Department had received the 2006 Life Safety Achievement Award from the Residential Fire Safety Institute. He explained they were one of 678 fire departments throughout the Country to have received this award for 2006. He commented that while only 20% of calls were residential, 80% of fatalities occurred in residences.

Mayor Hindman pointed out Michael Linzi-Hayes was significantly responsible for the Fire Department receiving this award and presented him with a Certificate of Appreciation for his life saving actions on October 9, 2007. He understood Mr. Linzi-Hayes was outside when he heard a smoke alarm and saw smoke coming out of the house. He explained Mr. Linzi-Hayes asked an adult to call 911 and shouted to warn his Mother to get out of the house, which she did. Due to Mr. Linzi-Hayes' quick action, the Fire Department was able to get to the fire promptly and put it out. He noted Mr. Linzi-Hayes acted properly by not entering the house and yelling for his Mother as it prevented injury. He stated the community was proud of him. Chief Markgraf presented Mr. Linzi-Hayes with a medal. Mr. Linzi-Hayes stated everyone could be a hero every once in a while and to not be afraid to stand up.

Mayor Hindman explained Michael Williams, Brian Heiberger and Randy Plattner were at the Olive Garden on April 20, 2007 when Tatiana Sosova choked on a piece of food. Mr. Williams, her son-in-law, and Mr. Heiberger, the culinary manager of the Olive Garden, saw Ms. Sosova choking and tried to dislodge the food using the Heimlich maneuver. Mr.

Plattner, a customer, also tried and successfully dislodged the food. Due to the three of them working together to take quick action, they were able to save a life. He stated the City was proud of them and presented each of them a plaque. Chief Markgraf presented each of them with a citizen lifesaving award.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Chip Cooper - Federal Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Program.

Mayor Hindman noted Mr. Cooper withdrew his request to speak.

John Clark - A proposal for a second class of building permits as it relates to affordable housing and meaningful enforcement of rental compliance ordinances and property maintenance standards.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, provided a handout and stated he was one of three people who had filed to be the next Council Person for the First Ward. He explained he was asking the Council to consider establishing a second class of building permits for work required by the City on residential rental property in order to receive certification under the City's rental compliance ordinance or on other residential properties that received a notice of violation of the City's property maintenance ordinances. Currently, there was one building permit with a term of 18 months which was abused to delay repairs for the maximum amount of time. He was proposing a second building permit be created with an initial term of 60 days that could be extended for an additional 30 days upon payment of a significant additional fee. He pointed out this was only for the work needing to be done to bring these properties into compliance. It was not for new construction. In order to make this work, he suggested a severe penalty for landlords of residential rental properties if the work was not completed within the appropriate period of time. He commented that the landlord would be required to house the tenants somewhere else until it was fixed dependent on the lease. He explained the idea was to get their attention. For other residential properties, he thought the Council should consider strong abatement provisions. He stated inadequate code enforcement was a threat to every residential neighborhood in Columbia and, in particular, the residential neighborhoods north of Broadway in the First Ward. He believed inadequate code enforcement was a key factor in the decreasing percentage of owner occupancy in a neighborhood. He commented that code enforcement might have improved recently, but he could not find any hard evidence. He felt it was still not enough and that staffing needed to be increased in order to make this happen. He asked the Council to make code enforcement one of its priorities by creating a second class of building permits. He stated he believed vigorous code enforcement was essential in preserving the existing housing stock and preservation of the existing housing stock was a key strategy in creating and maintaining affordable housing for low to moderate income families in Columbia. The lack of code enforcement was one of the factors causing deterioration in the Central City. He believed this would provide a mechanism to ensure code enforcement took place and would be useful in increasing compliance with the City's rental compliance ordinance and property maintenance standards. He noted there was more to be done than just this, but felt this was a key component.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(A) Proposed non-motorized intersection improvements at Forum Boulevard and Stadium Boulevard.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was one of three intersection improvements, which were brought forward in August. The other two were moving forward, but this one was tabled to allow for additional work. An interested parties meeting was held on October 9, 2007. He asked Mr. Glascock to describe what had been initially proposed and any new suggestions.

Mr. Glascock stated this was initially a public hearing to look at the intersection to accommodate pedestrian usage. Using the overhead, he explained they were trying to have crosswalks across Forum and across Stadium. He pointed to the speed table and noted they were trying to get people who were turning right to slow down when entering Forum because they were currently going through there at a high rate of speed. He pointed to a pedestrian haven and explained it was a place to stand until the next light or signal activation for people who were caught in the middle. He showed the locations of the dual lefts and the planted median. He noted two concerns were expressed at the first public hearing. One was the delay it would generate for large trucks, such as WB67's with 53 foot trailers, serving the businesses in the area. In addition, there was a concern regarding the off tracking that would occur over the island for larger trucks due to the turning movements from Stadium onto Forum. The design vehicle for this type of intersection was a WB50, which had a 45 foot trailer. He stated they were suggesting pulling the island back so the trucks could make the turn without running over the island. In regard to the delay, he noted that would occur any time pedestrians were accommodated over vehicles.

Mayor Hindman understood the report suggested not constructing the median at this time. Mr. Glascock replied they were recommending it be pulled back. He did not think they wanted to remove the median. He stated that comment was a result of miscommunication. Mayor Hindman asked what pulling it back meant. Mr. Glascock pointed to the nose of the island on the overhead and explained how the trailer would travel to cause it to go over the top of the island. They were suggesting pulling it back so the off tracking did not occur. He noted there was no safe haven in that situation. The pedestrian would have to make it all of the way across the street if it was pulled back. Mayor Hindman understood they would essentially be removing the pedestrian safe haven and asked why they could not pull it back, but still provide the safe haven. Mr. Glascock replied it could be skewed, but it would take longer for the pedestrian to get across causing more of a delay.

Mr. Wade asked if a pedestrian or bicyclist would get more time to get across if they pushed the signalized button. Mr. Glascock replied they would have the same amount of time either way, but noted it might not actuate if the button was not pushed. Mr. Wade asked if there had been consideration for adding a few seconds if the button was pushed to increase safety for the pedestrians. Mr. Glascock replied if they did not push the button, the pedestrian cycle did not activate. Mr. Wade understood there was no time if they did not push the button. Mr. Glascock replied that was correct. Mr. Wade asked if that was clearly communicated by a sign. Mr. Glascock replied they could provide special signing if necessary. Mr. Wade thought that should be considered.

Mr. Skala understood part of the problem was that the engineering was based on the WB50, but the WB67 caused problems with the trailer coming over the island. He asked if that was true even if the WB67 truck was in the interior turn lane and turned onto the exterior lane of Forum. Mr. Glascock replied that if they went to the exterior lane, they would probably not off track. If they stayed in the interior lane, they would off track. Mr. Skala asked if there was a way to get a message across suggesting the WB67 trucks use a wide turn radius so they would not compromise the pedestrian island. Mr. Glascock replied they could sign it that way. Mr. Skala commented that he hated to compromise a pedestrian safety island whether or not it was pulled back.

Mayor Hindman asked if this had been approved by MoDOT. Mr. Glascock replied MoDOT had approved the WB50 design. Mayor Hindman understood they suggested it be designed around the WB50. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Mayor Hindman understood that was the standard primarily used for city deliveries and this intersection was designed according to MoDOT standards.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Jay Lindner, 1400 Forum Boulevard, thanked the Council for the extra time allowed to study this intersection. He commented that the Public Works staff had done a great job in working with everyone and he was hopeful they would come out with a better situation as a result. He stated he understood even the WB50's in the interior lane would off track across the island and if they did not, they would encroach into the second left turn lane creating a conflict point between trucks and vehicles as another safety issue. He noted their shopping center generated a tremendous number of WB67's daily for deliveries and from the beginning they did not believe the island would be a safe zone. He did not believe it was a safe haven for pedestrians crossing the intersection because there was not enough room with Stadium Boulevard on the other side. His suggestion was to pull back the tip of the island to just short of the pedestrian crossing, so if someone were stuck in the intersection, they would still have a concrete median to stand on. He pointed out they would not be telling them they would be safe. He agreed the improvements were needed and it would be nice to have additional capacity for pedestrians and bicycles in the area, but felt they needed to maintain safety for both vehicles and pedestrians without giving them false hope.

Mr. Skala understood the suggestion was to pull back the median and not give pedestrians the impression they had a safe haven and asked if the idea of skewing the crosswalk slightly and pulling the median back was a reasonable compromise between the truck traffic and pedestrian safety. Mr. Lindner replied he was not sure it had to be skewed if they pulled the tip of the island back to the point of where the pedestrian crossing was today. It would still stick out past the left turn lanes where the drivers stopped, but would provide a better situation. He understood an idea was brought up for signs to notify the trucks to be in the right left-turn lane and wondered if they would encroach into the inside left turn lane causing a conflict with vehicles. He pointed out for a truck to be in the right lane, they would get stuck trying to turn left into the Forum Shopping Center. They would not have the ability to do this without stopping on Forum and blocking traffic. In addition, he did not think they would be able to get the truckers to change their ways even if it was signed. He reiterated he

believed that even without skewing the crossing, the tip of the island should be pulled back to create more space for the trucks.

Paulette Hansen, 1314 St. Christopher Street, stated she was President of the Westwinds Park Neighborhood Association, which was located north of Stadium directly across from Schnucks. She pointed out they had not had a formal meeting, but had communicated with members via e-mail and noted they were happy with this proposal as they were looking forward to a better pedestrian crossing at this intersection. She commented that they saw bicyclists, joggers and children using this intersection after school to go to Schnucks or Dairy Queen. While in her kitchen, she would frequently hear traffic screeching trying to stop. She stated it was just becoming more and more congested, so they really needed to make the intersection safer.

Mayor Hindman asked if she was in favor of keeping the raised median that was proposed. Ms. Hansen replied yes.

Rick Hansen, 1314 St. Christopher, commended the efforts of PedNet and the City for making the streets and sidewalks safer and more accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists. He explained he commuted to work daily on his bicycle and supported the plan to make Stadium and Forum safer and more accessible to pedestrians and cyclists. He stated he believed the original proposal was the best method at this time. He explained he had crossed the intersection several hundred times by bicycle or by walking and it had always been a challenge. He noted there had been numerous car accidents and at least one occasion where a cyclist was hit by a car at this intersection. He stated motorists often ran the light and drove faster than the proposed speed limit on Stadium. In addition to the plan to improve the intersection for pedestrians and cyclists, he recommended the speed limit be no more than 45 mph on Stadium from West Boulevard to College Park Drive. He believed it would also be helpful to put up caution signs to inform motorists that the intersection had a crosswalk. He asked if most trucks that turned left onto Forum were in the right or left lane. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. Mr. Hansen thought if all of the trucks were in the right lane turning left, it would provide more room to maneuver. He understood they might have to go to the second stop light on Forum near the movie theatre to pull into the shopping center, but did not feel that was an inconvenience. He stated he was in support of the plan that was originally tabled for the longer median strip as he thought it would be safer than pulling it back.

Robert Johnson, 1025 Ashland Gravel Road, stated he was the Bicycle Education Coordinator for the PedNet Coalition and was in support of the proposed non-motorized transportation improvements to Forum and Stadium intersection in their original form. He explained he and his wife were car-free and used a bicycle for virtually all of their travel inside the City. Since they shopped by bike, they traveled through this intersection quite often. He believed bicycle lanes on Stadium were crucial because many cyclists rode on the shoulder along Stadium Boulevard. He noted it was perfectly legal for a bicycle to travel along the shoulder of a busy road and was typically preferred by both bicyclists and motorists. The problem with this was that the shoulders were not designed to be a travel way, so when the cyclist came to an intersection, they were on the right side of a right turn only lane and needed to move left into the regular straight through lane. Many cyclists found this to be a

stressful maneuver and many motorists frowned on a cyclist traveling on the “real road” although it was legal. He felt narrowing the traffic lanes to add a bike lane in that location was important for the goals of the federal grant and would allow a bike traveling down the shoulder to enter the newly formed bike lane between the right turn only lane and the traffic lane with the automobile yielding to the bicyclist before crossing the bike lane to enter the right turn only lane. The right turning bicyclist would simply enter the right turn lane. He commented that he believed the median needed to stay in some manner because there were six traffic lanes, a right turn only lane and two shoulders on Stadium, which made it a very intimidating place to cross as a pedestrian. He thought the median could be a refuge for people, such as the elderly, disabled or young, who could not make it across in the time permitted. He stated he liked the suggestion of limiting the size of trucks or making them use the right turn only lane. He understood there was also a concern about slowing down motor vehicle traffic and commented that anytime one took an existing road that was clearly designed only for automobile use and made it more attractive and safer for bicyclists and pedestrians, its level of service to automobiles would be less. It would require the narrowing of traffic lanes, removal of on-street parking or some other compromise in order to add bicycle lanes. If they rejected or watered down these improvements due to it slowing motor vehicle traffic, the goals of the non-motorized transportation grant would be in serious trouble.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was formally a member of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission and the Street Standards Design Study Group, which suggested the City hire outside consultants to help develop design standards for a number of these intersections. He noted he liked Mr. Lindner’s idea of moving it down because that would not require it to go askew. He stated he also liked Mr. Skala’s comment about getting the word out and explained truckers were technologically sophisticated, so he felt they would have 99 percent compliance within 3-6 months of putting the word out. He commented that the Lindner group owned the property to the right and could donate quite a bit of right-of-way to allow for a significant increase in the width of the road on Forum into which they were turning. He understood it might take some cut and fill, but thought it could be widened to receive trucks off of Stadium. He thought they could be a significant participant in paying for it as well. He stated Columbia adopted a policy to make the City a more bicyclist, pedestrian and wheel friendly town and he believed doing this with the cost of a little travel time for motorists was directly in line with that policy. In regard to the timing of the crosswalk, he wondered if it could be adjusted for certain times of the day to accommodate the situation.

Claire Baffaut, 604 Redbud Lane, stated she was in favor of a raised median on Stadium Boulevard because it gave the perception of safety to pedestrians, which she felt was needed to increase pedestrian traffic and to meet the ultimate goal of the grant. She commented that she worked at 101 Park de Ville, which was close to the intersection of Broadway and Park de Ville. This intersection did not initially have a raised median, but did now. She explained her work location was less than a five minute walk from the restaurants and shops across from Hy-Vee. Before the median was installed on Broadway, very few of her co-workers would agree to walk to those restaurants for lunch. Now that the median had been built, many of her co-workers were walking for lunch. She noted she had never seen anyone stop in the middle at the raised median, but it provided a perception of safety which

was needed to encourage many to walk. She stated she was in support of the median as it was designed.

Ellen Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, stated she was in support of the original proposal for the intersection improvements. As a pediatrician, she saw the terrible health toll on children due in part to infrastructure that discouraged or prohibited active transportation. She felt this was a great opportunity to make a change in the right direction. Although the median strip was not a true pedestrian refuge, she believed it could serve as one in a pinch and would reduce the psychological barrier posed by crossing six lanes of traffic. She recounted an incident at the intersection last winter when she could not get to the pedestrian button due to snow and ice being in the way. She lined up with the cars on Forum to cross and started out as quickly as she could, but the light was short and turned yellow as she started through because the pedestrian light had not been activated. She noted she was stuck out there. Had there been a small median island, she could have taken refuge until the next cycle. She understood this was an unusual circumstance, but noted things happened and not everyone moved by cars. She stated the Council had a chance to make a meaningful change that permitted safe pedestrian and bicycle crossing of a major road. She believed car drivers would also benefit from the visibility of the raised median. When wet and dark, it was almost impossible to see the lines on Stadium as one approached the light. The median could be a visual marker for the edge of the left turn lane.

Dale Brigham, 2202 Hillshire Court, stated he rode his bike through this intersection twice a day as he commuted to work at MU, so he had a personal interest in the proposed improvements and supported them being implemented in their original design format. He commented that he also had a professional interest in this. He explained he worked with communities to help increase opportunities for physical activity for their citizens in order to help improve the health of people. He noted fewer than half of Missouri adults received an adequate amount of physical activity causing an increased risk of chronic disease and obesity costing the State of Missouri over 1.6 billion dollars per year. If they looked at that in comparison to the number of citizens in this community, they were talking about tens of millions of dollars per year. He understood changing this intersection would not alleviate the problem in this State or community, but believed it was a step in the right direction as they needed to make a lot of small, cumulative steps to help with this crisis. He stated the Council could help improve the health of the citizens in this community by embracing the improvements as planned.

Steve Spellman, 2200 Ridgemont, stated he lived about one-half mile down the hill from Schnucks on the south end of College Park Drive and was a bicycle commuter. He noted he passed through this intersection most days and usually came up Ridgemont to the intersection of Mills Drive across from Break Time and was in the left turn lane to turn onto the right hand drive lane on Forum toward Stadium with the destination of the Westwinds walkway to connecting to Westwind past the park to West Boulevard and so on. He commented that the alignment of the bike lane on Forum was what he attempted to do even though it was not currently striped. He explained he made his way toward the crosswalk to push the indicator as a pedestrian. He supported the way the lane was designed as it would alleviate the question of where he was supposed to be as a cyclist. In addition, he felt the

Australian right turn was a benefit for pedestrian, bike, wheelchair and vehicular traffic. He thought it would lessen accidents where someone was under the assumption the car in front of them was gone because they were already looking over their left shoulder. It also presented the pedestrians and bikes in a better position. He stated he supported the project in its current format.

Mary Zieha, 1315 St. Christopher Street, noted she had not driven since 1985 so she had reason to use the intersection. She asked where the disability area would be located on the raised island. Mr. Glascock asked if she was asking about the flat area for a wheelchair. Ms. Zieha replied yes. Mr. Glascock pointed to it the overhead. Ms. Zieha asked if the raised area would be two feet and wondered if that could be eliminated to help with some of the truck movement. Mr. Glascock replied he believed it was a four foot median with a four foot radius. Ms. Zieha stated she wanted to be sure there was a good one and thought with a lot of road markings they might be able to gain some space and still help pedestrians.

Tim Overshiner, 1300 Garden Court, stated he believed the island was just an illusion of safety when there was none. He did not think it needed to exist to make it a safer intersection. He believed the timing across six lanes of traffic needed to be adjusted. It currently counted down 20 seconds, which was essentially 5 seconds per lane. If a kid's shoe came untied, they would not make it. He did not think the median would be a safe place to rest and felt having the median made an even more dangerous intersection. He noted another issue was that the right turn arrow was green when one had the 20 seconds to cross, so the cars had the right-of-way making it difficult for people to get across. He agreed they could pull the median back to slow down traffic or clearly define the lanes, but was hesitant to say it was a safe area for pedestrians.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she went through the intersection multiple times per day as a car commuter and always saw pedestrians and bikers trying to get through the intersection, which she did not feel was safe. She noted she was in support of the original proposal, which included the narrowing of the lanes on Forum and Stadium, the raised median and marked bike lanes. She stated she wanted to commute to downtown on her bike on the weekends and felt marked lanes would help her feel safer.

Simon Rose, 2205 Katy Lane, explained he went through this intersection quite a bit and believed it was one of the worst intersections in Columbia to negotiate on bike or on foot. He stated he supported this as it was proposed. He understood Mr. Lindner's concern regarding trucks turning there, but thought that could be addressed with adequate signage. In the end, he thought everyone would win as he believed the customers of the shopping center would be happier whether in a car, on a bike or on foot.

Steve Mudrick, 1015 Prospect, stated he lived to the west of West Boulevard and north of Stadium Drive and he and his wife walked through this intersection often to go to the shopping center and theatre. In addition, his son rode his bike through there often. He did not have an opinion as to whether it should be the original plan or whether it should be changed to skew the crosswalk, but did believe they needed some kind of pedestrian haven or median protection. He noted he also agreed with Dr. Thomas' comments regarding the conditions in winter as he had climbed over a pile of snow in the past in order to get to Stadium. Someone with a bike, child or cart would be slowed down even more. He thought it

was important to have some kind of protection in the middle of the road in case it was needed.

Todd Shelby, 1216 Francis Drive, stated he and his wife often walked to the shopping center and he was in favor of the original proposal. He commented that in addition to having to climb over ice and snow to hit the pedestrian button, if it rained, there was a large puddle they had to walk through to get to the button. He thought they might want to consider correcting that problem as well.

Dianna O'Brien, 1200 Sunset Drive, stated one of the reasons they moved to this neighborhood was because of the ability to go to the shopping center. She noted her stepson, who was in a wheelchair lived with them, and having the crosswalk allowed him to live an independent life. She commented that when she traveled with him, she was terrified because they never made it across the street in the time allotted. She stated she and her husband now use the intersection with their dogs and still do not make it across in the time allotted. She thought it was a dangerous situation and noted the cars turning right onto Stadium never stopped. She would love to see this improved as their goal was to exercise and not use a vehicle.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated that although she did not live in that area, she wanted to see the median there. She would not want to cross the street without a haven in case something did happen. She noted a lot of people who were disabled did not have a car and were dependent upon wheelchairs to get everywhere.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, commented that since 1998, he had served as a citizen volunteer on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission and on various occasions they had noted specific intersections that were difficult to cross for pedestrians, people using wheelchairs and bicyclists. While the establishing ordinances required one member of the Commission to have some familiarity with road construction, they were all novices at reading street plans and engineering charts. They had been discussing the need to improve the intersection at Forum and Stadium for a long time. He noted the present crosswalk to the trail from Westwinds Drive was an improvement over the prior conditions, but felt it could be better. Members of the Commission often understood the present configuration was not be right, but could not determine what specific improvements were needed, and therefore, often recommended a professional be consulted. Since federal non-motorized pilot program funds were available to engage a professional consulting firm, he thought the Council should go with its recommendation. He commented that having lived with Ms. Weinschenk, he had become familiar with the Americans with Disabilities Act and noted it covered two categories. One was physical facilities and the second was programs. In his opinion, since the City had a program to encourage non-motorized transportation, it included people with wheelchairs. He noted she could not jump up on a raised median and if they were not going to provide a facility for someone who used a wheelchair, they were not really providing for everyone.

Mayor Hindman stated he understood this plan, as originally drafted, provided for wheelchairs through the median.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Janku wondered how someone with a wheelchair would get through there and asked if the median was raised at that point. Mr. Glascock replied no and pointed out it had an opening.

Mr. Wade asked how this proposal varied from the original proposal. He did not think there was a lot of variation. Mr. Glascock replied it was just a matter of the median being pulled back. Mr. Wade understood the only issue was whether the median extended past the crosswalk or was up to the crosswalk.

Mr. Wade thanked everyone that took the time and effort to make their thoughts known tonight and in the past month. He commented that four groups emerged and all had two concerns. One was the efficiency of traffic movement for automobiles, bikes and pedestrians and the emphasis was dependent on what one's primary interest was in terms of mode of transportation. The second was safety. In regard to automobiles, it was reducing the accident rate, especially in terms of right turns onto Stadium. For bikers, it was safely crossing lanes of traffic and getting to the bike routes. For the pedestrians, it was primarily crossing Stadium, but also included crossing one side of Forum to the other. Not only did the intersection need to become safer, but the perception of the intersection as a place one could safely negotiate was also necessary if people were going to walk and bike that area. He commented that he had communications with several families on the north side of Stadium who wanted to use it for walking and biking, but did not due to the perception of the lack of safety. He noted there was a third concern with regard to truck turning and whether the design should be for the WB67 or the WB50. He pointed out he did not support the relegating of trucks to one lane or another. He wanted the trucks to pick the lane they would want to turn from and if he was beside them, he hoped he would be able to negotiate it safely. In regard to safety, this design would allow for substantial reduction of automobile accidents at the intersection which benefited everyone. The one area of contention was how far the median bulb would go out. He recommended the bulb come out to the crosswalk, but not beyond it because there was not enough space to have a true safe haven and barely enough space for a wheelchair to sit in there. Having the bulb extend past the sidewalk gave the illusion of a safe haven. He noted the median needed to be close to the crosswalk, so there was an emergency safe location. He stated he supported pulling the median back to just before the crosswalk started because it created the perception that it was an emergency place, not a safe haven. It also allowed the truckers the ability to negotiate the intersection. He complimented the staff for their recommendation of doing a long term impact study. He explained this was an experimental project he hoped the rest of the Country would learn from. He believed the study should be expanded to include the other two Stadium intersections, which had different characteristics. The data could be provided to the rest of the Country illustrating the differences and the City's experiences. He thanked the people from Westwinds for calling his attention to the obvious. He noted a critical element of pedestrian safety at this intersection involved the through lanes, especially the two Stadium lanes going west. What made this intersection different was that it was a three way intersection and not a four way intersection, which changed the dynamics of traffic. He commented that they could do everything right in the design of the intersection, but if they did

not build in a way of slowing traffic and did not have adherence to traffic laws, it would still be a dangerous crossing.

Mayor Hindman stated he used this intersection often both by bicycle and foot. He commented that when he first became Mayor, there was no crosswalk on Stadium between Highway 63 and Highway 70. It was a speedway where there was no facility for pedestrians. Slowly, they had made progress with this intersection as they had a crosswalk and a countdown timer, which was a tremendous help because it provided some sense of how long one had to cross. The City's goal and policy was to have a walkable Columbia and in order to have that, they needed situations where people were willing to go out and walk. At this intersection, there were six lanes needing to be crossed, which was intimidating. The City's goal in this process was to make this intersection a multi-modal intersection and one that worked for bicycles, pedestrians and automobiles. He noted some of the changes were favorable to the automobile in that the intersection would work better and reduce accidents. He stated when it came to going across Stadium they needed to make changes that would not cause people to be intimidated, which he believed would require the raised median and the bulb on the other side of the sidewalk. He commented that Dan Burden, the leading expert on walkable communities, indicated they needed to have bulbs because they provided safety or a sense of safety so people were willing to go across streets. In this situation, if someone was in a wheelchair or with kids and did not make it across, the bulb on the other side of the crosswalk would be beneficial. He noted they hired expert engineers who designed this to the standards set forth and that MoDOT, the Advisory Committee for the Non-Motorized Pilot Project and the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission had all approved the engineer's recommendation. It was only after the public meeting there any issue and that involved truck turning. He referred to the Park de Ville intersection and stated he believed it was the best designed intersection in the City. He noted it enabled people to go to the shopping centers because the perception was good. He stated one of the advantages of this neighborhood was the ability to easily go to Schnucks and the shopping center and pointed out people wanted an intersection that made them comfortable. He agreed there was too much speed at the intersection and that they needed to find a way to slow it down. He reiterated that walking was good and the City's policy was to encourage it. It provided for good health, was fun, was low in cost, saved money and resources and helped in the fight against climate change. He thought they needed to accept the plan as it was and believed the reason MoDOT suggested it be designed around the WB50 was because that was the size of standard delivery truck. He agreed a certain number of trucks would be WB67's and thought they could negotiate the intersection except during peak times. He stated one possibility was to move the whole thing to the east a little. He reiterated he wanted the bulb so it would appear to be a refuge. He understood the problem with that was they would need to angle the crosswalk, which would make it a little longer with a second or two difference. He thought it might be worth it to enable the WB67's to make the turn. He believed the design was basically what it ought to be.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was a countdown timer for the crosswalk. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Nauser stated she understood there was not an adequate amount of time to get across the roadway. She agreed with both Mayor Hindman and Mr. Wade in their recommendation of adjusting the median to provide a refuge or putting the crosswalk in at an angle if they increased the time allowed. He did not believe a 2-3 second increase would interfere with traffic movement that much. She commented that she had a problem with the suggestion of forcing trucks into the right hand lane because they would have difficulty maneuvering a large tractor trailer regardless of the time of day. She understood they could go to the movie theatre, but noted there was not much distance between the lights and it would be difficult to get a big rig started again at another light to try to move over. She envisioned traffic backing up when they were stuck on Forum. She stated she was in favor of the improvements, but thought it needed additional adjusting to accomplish all of the goals. She reiterated she was in favor of putting it in at more of an angle to allow for the median.

Mr. Skala stated he felt there were two perceptions here. One was the perception of safety in getting to the middle of the street and having a refuge island. The other was a perception of being safe once one was there, which had a lot to do with the bulb. He understood Mr. Glascock was talking about the bulb extending four feet beyond the crosswalk. He commented that it was possible some of the trucks would end up in the right lane because of trying to maximize their turning radius. He stated he wanted this to stay the way it was, but also did not want any unanticipated problems, such as a person in a wheelchair without the bulb or having a bulb which was too large causing trucks to go over it anyway. He thought the engineering question was how big of a bulb they really needed. He wondered if they needed two or four feet. If even more clearance was needed due to the large trucks, he wondered if they needed to move it back slightly. He asked if it was a two or four foot standard. Mr. Glascock replied it depended on the margin of error they wanted. He believed four foot was more acceptable as a margin of error for a tractor trailer making the turn because if it was two and they were two feet off, they would be on top of the wheelchair. He stated he preferred the four feet. Mr. Skala asked about the perception of the person driving the truck if it extended two feet further out into the intersection. Mr. Glascock replied he would want it two feet further out in the intersection because he would not want the driver to hit the person in the wheelchair.

Mr. Janku stated his experience with this intersection went back to before the pedestrian crossing was placed there. He recalled a teenager lost in the middle of Stadium trying to figure out the sequence of lights as he was not yet of driving age. He thought they needed the bulb because of the concept of the perception of safety as it was intimidating with traffic coming from the west at 50-55 mph. He was afraid it would lead to some bad decisions with people trying to get out of what they considered a perilous situation. He was not sure how much they could tinker with it and noted the traffic flow had been analyzed. He felt if they took seconds away from one aspect of movement, it would impact other aspects. He reiterated he thought they needed the bulb.

Ms. Hoppe stated she believed the bulb was needed as well. She stated she went through that intersection when going to work and hoped to use it for bicycling in the dark now that she could not take her regular route in the dark. She commented that many needed the bulb, such as mothers and people in wheelchairs, and thought the bigger it was the better it

would be. She believed it would also make it a safer intersection for cars because it would slow people down so they would pay attention. She thought this was a win/win situation. She stated it was a great situation for a property owner because there were so many people from surrounding neighborhoods that wanted to get to the commercial establishments. She thought many would want to have their businesses there because people wanted to go there. In terms of the turning of the 67 foot truck, she assumed the engineers understood there were 67 foot trucks going through there and it was workable. She noted her preference was to keep it as it was, but as a fallback, she would suggest the alternative of keeping the bulb and moving the crosswalk to the east. She felt increasing the time to cross the street was needed one way or the other because she did not think people could get across in twenty seconds. Mr. Glascock pointed out MoDOT had that control.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to proceed with the recommended intersection while having the authority to review the possibility of moving everything to the east and to do so if it worked with the understanding the general principles would remain the same. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Wade stated he was pleased this was tabled because it gave the opportunity for public engagement.

Mr. Skala agreed this had been a good process and believed it should be continued when making decisions that affected a lot of people's lives. He noted he received an e-mail just before the meeting from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission suggesting that when changes of this kind were considered to send it back to the original recommending board and/or commission for recommendations on the potential changes. He pointed out the motion made was pretty much the original recommendation from that Commission, but as a general rule, he agreed it was a good idea to send these things back to obtain the board or commission's opinion again.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Skala was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B330-07 Naming five east-west alleys in the downtown area.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated a public hearing was held by the Planning & Zoning Commission and after hearing testimony from the public, the Commission made minor modifications to the proposed names. He noted staff did not have a preference in terms of what the names were nor did they feel strongly about whether the alleys should be named. The reason the naming issue was brought up was to allow a property owner to obtain a building permit to allow a business off of an alley that would only have the alley address. Staff felt that was the overriding issue. He pointed out staff was proposing legislation for introduction, which would include four criteria as to whether or not a business should be able to obtain a building permit. They were suggesting considering the naming of the alleys with the legislation that was being introduced and would be considered at the next meeting.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

John Ott, 212 Bingham Road, stated he was the one who had requested a permit to begin construction on a project in the alley. He noted he had two pending projects. The

application for one was submitted to Protective Inspection in early spring. At that time, he understood the key issue was that the alleys needed to be named. He noted Mr. Janku brought up the idea of naming the alleys in 2004 and thought the time should be taken to do it right as there were some historical and marketing opportunities. He just hoped it did not prevent him from moving forward with his permit. He pointed out his neighbor had an application for permit with the City since July, so there were three projects waiting to be done. He understood there was an issue with regard to how the alleys would be maintained. He stated his expectation was that they be maintained how they were now with the exception of trying to accommodate customers as a business owner or land owner. This meant keeping them clean, ice-free and snow-free to the extent done for sidewalks and streets. He understood graffiti and lighting were issues as well. He believed people who wanted businesses in the alleys would go out of their way to improve them, so it would be a better scenario than they currently had. He asked them to name the alleys or perhaps provide a temporary address, so they could complete their work with the understanding they fully intended to do the right thing and cooperate with the City in maintaining their share of the alleyways.

Mayor Hindman asked which alley he wanted to do this on. Mr. Ott replied the alley between Ninth and Tenth Streets, south of Broadway. Mayor Hindman asked where the opening would be for the business. Mr. Ott described its location using the overhead and passed around a photo of what the store front/restaurant would look like when done. Mayor Hindman understood the store front was to the west of this photograph. Mr. Ott replied that was correct. Mayor Hindman asked if it was closer to Ninth Street or Tenth Street. Mr. Ott replied it was pretty much in the middle. He referred to the iron beam on the photo and noted when looking south it would face the private alley. Mr. Janku asked if that was by Harpos. Mr. Ott replied it was the westernmost side of Harpos. Mayor Hindman understood the public alley was the east/west alley. Mr. Ott replied yes. Mr. Janku understood it came out by Peckham and Wright. Mr. Ott stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe referred to the slide on the overhead and asked if those were trash receptacles or if some were building construction receptacles. Mr. Ott replied they were the normal trash receptacles today. He understood the Solid Waste District was encouraging compactors and collecting things in a central area. On this block, due to the public and private alleys meeting, he was proposing another solution, which they were awaiting a determination of whether or not would work. His suggestion was to use compactors located within the area. If that did not work, he was proposing they look at something in the private alley, such as a smaller compactor or fewer compactors and recycling, to allow for pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Ott noted a lot of the electrical wiring had been buried and additional lighting had been placed in the alley. He commented that this was an alley where the storm sewer was not working well. The one to the east collected water in an inlet before it crossed Tenth Street and dumped it into a culvert, which shot it out into this alley. It then ran down the alley into another inlet where it ran into an underwater storm sewer. They were proposing it be addressed with salt to prevent it from icing and hoped it would someday be an alley targeted for storm water improvement. He noted this alley received more pedestrian traffic than some

of streets on the perimeter of the District and believed it was natural for them to be commercially used. He pointed out in the end it would create more sales tax revenue.

Mayor Hindman asked when he applied for the building permit. Mr. Ott replied he believed he applied for it on February 21, 2007, but a letter was sent in March with some questions about various things. He noted, by the end of March, they had a complete application. Mayor Hindman asked for the reason given for not issuing the permit. Mr. Ott replied their original plan showed a separation between the front and back where one could not get from one side to the next. They agreed to create an opening between both for the purposes of getting the Manhattan Closet project, which faced Broadway, completed. They left the door in the basement, so theoretically someone could get from the front to the back. In addition, they did not receive a permit to do any work on the back. He noted some work had been done, but nothing that would prevent anyone from doing inspections. They were now at a place where they needed to continue their work. He understood it needed to be addressed and they could not address it. He also understood the Fire Department had new software, which required separate names because it would not allow a Broadway half a block north of Broadway or south of Broadway. He commented that there were currently some addresses, such as 906B or 906C, which only had one entrance, but those were done some time ago. The requirement now was a specific name to accommodate the new software.

Mayor Hindman understood there were other applications for building permits for the alleys. Mr. Ott stated he also had one for the back of 918 E. Broadway and understood there was one for 904 E. Broadway as well. Mayor Hindman asked which one he was concerned with now. Mr. Ott replied 906 E. Broadway was the one he needed to move forward on.

Brian Pape, 202 S. Glenwood, stated he was an architect and had been on the Historic Preservation Commission for the last few years. Although he was no longer on the Commission, he was at the last meeting when they voted on issues in regard to the naming of the alleys. He stated he was in favor of naming the alleys. He believed improved alleys added life and vitality to cities and felt it would be a wonderful thing for the City in general. He noted the Commission voted to not only support the naming of the alleys and allowing a permit for the business, but also decided to support individual names for each block. He explained in 2004, when the Commission was first asked to come up with some historic names for alleys, they realized the alleys were disjointed. Very few were continuance from one side of downtown to the other. He believed naming the alleys individually would solve a lot of problems because they would not have piece here and another piece several blocks away with nothing in between. In addition, former Mayor Smith's letter had so many suggestions for different parts of the downtown that it brought forth the idea of having unique names that were more localized. In regard to the issue of the Fire Department finding the alleys, he understood there were at least 100 short blocks around the City with separate names. He reiterated he was in support of having individual names for individual blocks and believed they could start very quickly with this one to allow the permit.

Ms. Hoppe asked for Mr. Pape's thoughts on having historic placards for each block to mark the historic significance of the area without naming each alley between each street a different name, which she believed would be a nightmare for visitors and people trying to find their way in Columbia. Mr. Pape thought a placards or description for why an alley was

named what it was very important because they could bring in the history of Columbia to show people how it grew and who the people were. He felt it was important to carry that theme on with alley names as it was a way to bring history to life.

Christy Koonse, stated she was a resident of Denver, Colorado who wanted to support her cousins and noted she was a former resident of Missouri and graduate of the University of Missouri. Her father, Kenneth Koonse, worked at the agricultural service on Vandiver Drive and her uncle was Mel Koonse, who owned Koonse Glass Company. She commented that they were in favor of block by block alley naming. They felt it would be safer for fire and other services to have a specific place versus saying the alley behind such a street. In addition, there were numerous Columbians that could be honored and this was one opportunity to do that. She stated they would like to honor Frederick Moss Prewitt, who was a former Curator of the University of Missouri and a founder of Stephens College. She explained their interest was in the block between Eighth and Ninth Streets as his mercantile shop and bank were located there on Broadway. He also lived at Tenth and Cherry Street. She asked the Council to consider block by block naming and for one to be named Prewitt Place.

Glen Strothmann, 33 East Broadway, stated he had several buildings in downtown Columbia, so this impacted him as well. One of his buildings was next door to Mr. Ott's building at 904 Broadway and he currently had a request for a permit on that building as well. He stated he was in support of naming the alleys as he thought it was a great opportunity. He also believed they should be individually named as it added a lot of character. He referred to the Caribbean and noted they had alleys in very quaint old historic warehouse districts and denoted each alley. He thought it was easier to figure out where one was in the maze of alleys by having individual names. He also thought it would be easier for emergency services to be able to identify a specific block. He noted that if they were going to encourage these to be a pedestrian area, which he preferred, they would not have the luxury to drive around through the alleys to find various addresses and business locations. If they knew it was in a specifically named alley with a historic figure, it would lend itself to promoting business, commerce and walkability in the downtown area. With regard to permitting, he pointed out they had to design the plans for his building to be able to move forward in a fashion where only a single user could use the entire building coming off of Broadway, which he felt was wasteful. He understood there would be some difficulties for the City along with the building owners in figuring out where the electric and telephone wires went as it was a monumental task, but thought it needed to be done structurally, electrically and in terms of fire hazards. He stated they would be making the building a lot safer. He thought they needed to move forward with this and noted it made more sense to be able to have a second tier of shops for people who could not afford or did not need a large amount of space for their business.

Mayor Hindman asked if 904 was his building. Mr. Strothmann replied yes. Mayor Hindman asked if 918 was his building. Mr. Strothmann replied no. He stated he had a current application for 904 Broadway. Mayor Hindman asked if he had started construction on that. Mr. Strothmann replied they were allowed a demolition permit, but had been stumbling through the permitting process since then. Mayor Hindman asked when he made

his application. Mr. Strothmann replied July. Mayor Hindman asked what he planned to do if he had the permit. Mr. Strothmann replied they wanted to be able to eliminate interior walls in planning their structure depending on the users of the property. At this particular time, they would not be able to have residential apartments or businesses that would empty out onto the alley, so they had to redraw the plans and build it as a shell while waiting for the naming of the alleys in order to open them up for more flexible uses. Mayor Hindman asked if he had built the shell yet. Mr. Strothmann replied no. He pointed out they would be asking for a balcony on the front of the building.

Mr. Janku asked about the name of his store front on Broadway. Mr. Strothmann stated he believed he had one of the more attractive buildings in downtown Columbia at 1020 Broadway, which was known as the Pasta Factory building, and one of the ugliest buildings on Broadway, which was at 904 Broadway and was previously the ladies Puckett's building. It was remodeled in the 1980's and had a shorter store front. The plan was to completely strip it and go back to period architecture on the front of the building.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Skala asked if the delay was due to staff wanting to identify alleys for various reasons and not due to the naming of the alleys or determining if they should be individually named. Mayor Hindman stated he understood staff wanted a policy decision and had proposed something with B380-07 under the Introduction and First Reading section of the agenda.

Mr. Janku asked if B380-07 was passed on November 19, 2007 and the City Manager evaluated the pending projects, if they would be able to proceed without alley names or if they would need to have names in place. He asked if it could be amended to allow them to start work without completing their work for a certain period of time. Mr. Watkins replied that was a possibility. He explained they were looking for guidance from the Council as to whether they wanted businesses off of the alley and whether there should be any conditions and/or considerations. Mr. Janku stated he believed the time to discuss that was in two weeks. Mr. Watkins noted staff was of the opinion that there were some considerations making some alleys appropriate for businesses and others not so appropriate. Mr. Janku thought they should discuss that at the next meeting because this was dealing with the naming of the alleys. He thought they could provide a temporary name or discuss this at the next meeting. He did not think they had to address the naming issue tonight.

Mr. Skala asked if they were awaiting an evaluation of those places that might or might not be appropriate. Mr. Watkins stated if the Council provided a name and there was no guidance to staff indicating concerns, staff would provide a building permit, which meant Council was leaning toward opening a business.

Mr. Janku stated he was in favor of businesses opening in alleys, but thought they needed to have a good discussion on standards and the legislation dealing with standards was not before them tonight. He noted he did not want to provide a temporary name on an alley for two weeks time when conceivably they could change their mind based on more information from staff and others in two weeks. He thought they could keep the naming process going by obtaining recommendations from the commissions, but address the

standards two weeks from tonight. He suggested that versus doing something tonight that might confer that right without discussion.

Mr. Wade agreed, but stated he thought they needed to stop and acknowledge the process they were engaged in was backwards because it did not deal with the broad range of issues. He understood the Council tried to deal with naming the alleys several years ago and did not, so they were now at a point where specific action needed to be taken because people wanted to move forward. He believed if they were going to put in place the pieces for developing a vital and lively downtown, the alleys needed to be included, but in terms of pedestrian life and clear criteria. He noted there were 22 blocks of alleys and once the criteria was in place, some of those blocks would need to be taken off the board because they would not meet the criteria. He thought there needed to be a clear definition for the whole community as to which blocks were subject to meeting the criteria. The potential for enhancing the quality of the experience for downtown was substantial and by adding an important historical component to it, the issue of having fifteen names was not a problem. He believed they would have maps and SBD would create walking tours taking people through the alleys and the historical experience. He stated the names were the last decision. He felt the policy needed to be in place for them to assess the blocks to determine which ones would meet the criteria. At the same time, the Historic Preservation Commission needed to go ahead to begin doing the historic research and those minutes should be provided to Council for consideration. He understood they thought they could do as many as three names by the end of the year because of the research that was necessary. He thought this could move together and that the naming of the alley could occur after the permit had been given as long as the alley met the criteria.

Mayor Hindman asked if he was saying they could pass the legislation the staff was recommending at the next meeting with staff then issuing a building permit. Mr. Wade replied yes, if the alley the building permit was being requested for met the criteria for usable alleys.

Mayor Hindman stated he thought Mr. Ott should be entitled to get a building permit and did not want him to have to wait while they made long-term policy decisions. Mr. Wade stated he did not either. Mayor Hindman asked if Council passed the bill, which was currently under the Introduction and First Reading section of this agenda at the next meeting, if Mr. Ott would be able to get his building permit upon meeting the criteria. He explained he wanted to know how quickly they could get Mr. Ott his building permit.

Ms. Nauser stated she was in favor of developing the alleys as it was innovative, but she was also an advocate of establishing policy before moving forward. She liked the idea of naming the alleys individual names with historic significance. It would provide a new marketing tool for the downtown. She noted the bill being introduced was very vague and did not appear to set the same criteria for everyone. She believed if it had to have vehicular access for emergency vehicles, they would need to determine the width the alley. It stated it would have to accommodate emergency vehicles and she wondered what that would be. She wanted something concrete so everyone was on the same playing field. She did not like subjectivity. She thought everyone should know what they would have to meet before beginning to look at a project. In reading the report, she thought staff had an idea of what

was needed, but it was not reflected in the bill. She noted staff would have two weeks to work on definitive criteria so they could move forward.

Mr. Wade stated that would give them the ability to deal with each alley as permits came up in terms of the naming process, especially if they completed the analysis of the alleys to determine which met the criteria.

Mr. Skala stated he could not make a decision in the absence of information. He thought it was appropriate to have some policy in place and believed it could be done. He agreed the naming of the alleys was important, but did not believe that was the limiting factor here as they might be able to provide a temporary name. He assumed the people who were requesting these permits were doing as much as they could in an area that would accommodate that type of development.

Ms. Hoppe understood staff indicated the building owners would be able to proceed once an address was provided, so she wanted to see that happen as soon as possible. She also wanted to make it work well and understood the criteria and policy was important, but wanted to move ahead with it quickly. She did not believe this was a question of whether or not they should use the alleys because the alleys were being used now with back entrances, people walking and biking through the alleys and parking. She thought the question was whether the alleys were used as well as they could be or should be. She believed this was a great opportunity for real vitality and that there were a lot of practical solutions in regard to the criteria and concerns. She did not think they would be obstacles or barriers. She noted she was in favor of having the policy, but also in moving forward quickly so they could allow these business owners to proceed with businesses.

Mr. Janku agreed with moving forward and getting a good policy in place. In regard to naming, he thought the historic names could be used in places other than just the downtown alleys. He wondered if they wanted to table this issue to a date certain to allow time for recommendations to come back from the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mayor Hindman stated he did not agree with a lot of what had been said. He noted Mr. Ott had asked for a building permit in February. If the City was going to establish policy, it should have been done then. He pointed out they had been begging people to make investments in downtown Columbia in order to make it a historical and beautiful downtown. They had someone who was willing to invest in many downtown buildings and who wanted to put a shop in the alley. He understood all of them had indicated they wanted to see that happen. He noted eight months had gone by and they were now starting to talk about policy. He thought that was wrong. He did not believe they would do any harm in providing this person a building permit. If they wanted to develop a policy, he thought that was fine, but did not believe they should hold up the building permit because of it. He stated he thought they should name the alley, Alley A, to allow him to have his building permit.

Ms. Nauser asked if they should provide it without addressing of any of the issues. Mayor Hindman suggested they put a moratorium on future building permits until those issues were addressed, but he did not believe it was right for them to delay his person after eight months.

Ms. Nauser asked why they were just finding out about this now. She wondered why they were not notified of the issue when the naming of the alleys came up. Mayor Hindman

commented that according to testimony, he was held up because the alley was not named. Ms. Nauser understood. She noted when the naming of the alleys issue was brought before the Council, they could have been working on a policy at that same time. They only found out about the policy issue a month ago.

Mr. Wade stated he thought everyone wanted to expedite the process. The question was whether they would be trapping themselves into making every decision on every permit if they made a decision on this one. Mayor Hindman did not think they would because they could pass a policy.

Mr. Wade stated neither way was the way it should be. Mayor Hindman agreed. Mr. Wade thought the question was how to move forward in a way that was fair to this situation while beginning to put the criteria into a rational form with staff making the decisions in a policy framework.

Ms. Nauser agreed and thought they could approach this like they did with the balcony. They made a decision on the situation that came up and allowed subjective criteria while they worked on the overarching policy. She thought they needed policy and noted it was their job as the Council to set policy. She commented that they should be setting policy for the entire downtown, not just for one person, and noted if there was a way to expedite this, she was in favor of it, but did not feel they should continue unless they had some kind of policy directive indicating where they wanted to go. Mayor Hindman stated he was not arguing about policy. He just felt they should not be talking about it in November when the application was submitted in February.

Mr. Skala stated there was merit on both sides of this issue. He noted he was sympathetic with Mr. Ott with regard to the permit and would be willing to find a compromise. He agreed it was a long time to wait for something they anticipated would be okay. He stated he was willing to proceed with providing a temporary exception. He agreed policy was what they wanted to head toward.

Mr. Glascock commented that they allowed any developer or builder to use third party inspection in order to move forward at their own risk. He noted they would not be able to obtain a CO until there was a policy, but could move forward with a third party inspection. Mr. Janku asked if they did not have to name the alley to allow them to move forward. Mr. Glascock replied no. Mayor Hindman understood they were assigning a significant risk to the developer. Mr. Glascock agreed, but noted they took that risk often in order to proceed. Mr. Janku asked what a third party inspection meant. Mr. Glascock replied an engineer who was not part of City staff would inspect to ensure the rules were followed. Mr. Janku understood that had been done before. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Nauser asked about the other issues that were brought forward. Mr. Glascock replied he was trying to provide a way to move it forward. Mr. Skala understood that would be independent of any decisions. Ms. Hoppe wondered if they should hear from the owners.

Mr. Ott stated he preferred not to have the third party inspection at this point because there was a lot of risk and additional expense involved. He noted if he knew a good policy would be established in two weeks, he would just wait. He feared two weeks would turn into six weeks.

Mr. Strothmann stated he concurred with Mr. Ott. He pointed out they were operating under building codes, so there was policy. They could not just go into the alleys and work on these buildings without some sort of oversight. Plans had to be approved and followed. He thought they were only waiting for the alleys to be named so they could have addresses.

Mr. Wade understood there were three applications. Mayor Hindman replied yes. Mr. Wade asked if they were all for the same block. Mayor Hindman replied they were all in the 900 block.

Mr. Watkins understood the Council wanted the idea of businesses off of alleys to move forward. He commented that standards were a good thing, but not critical right now as he did not think anyone felt criteria for issuing a building permit was to figure out how to deal with snow removal. If a building owner could not open his store due to snow, it would just be part of the risk of opening in the alley. He suggested they name the alley, Alley A, or pick one of the names suggested. They could deal with the criteria at a future time. Staff understood they wanted to allow this to happen, so as soon as the alley was named, they would issue the building permit. He noted a formal name could be provided later.

Mayor Hindman stated he was most interested in the application made in February. Mr. Janku pointed out they were all in the same block.

Mayor Hindman suggested a motion to name the 900 block "Alley A," but was uncertain as to what to do with the rest of the ordinance. Mr. Janku thought they could delete the rest of it because they were asking a commission for recommendations. In addition, they had issues other than the names, such as the continuity. A new ordinance could be brought forward when they had it all sorted out. Mayor Hindman stated he believed they needed to move forward with the policy, which they could deal with at the next meeting.

Mr. Boeckmann suggested the Council amend the bill so the title read "an ordinance naming an alley within the downtown area and fixing the time when this ordinance shall become effective," Section 1 read "the unnamed alley running east/west between East Broadway and Cherry Street, between Ninth Street and Tenth Street, is hereby named Alley A" and Section 2 read "this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage." He noted they would be deleting all of the other references.

Mr. Skala understood that essentially put a moratorium on any other permits because those other alleys would not yet be named.

Mayor Hindman made the motion to amend B333-07 per Mr. Boeckmann's suggestion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Wade asked if they should direct the Historic Preservation Commission to begin researching names for that alley as a part of this or as part of something separate. Mr. Janku thought they had already referred the naming issue to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Wade stated he was asking about them beginning their research specifically for this block. Mr. Janku thought they would move forward with it. Mayor Hindman thought they would work on the entire downtown.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Skala was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B330-07, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(B) Construction of street improvements on Hunt Avenue, from Worley Street to I-70 Drive Southwest.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated staff needed Council direction as to whether they should proceed or make specific modifications to the plan.

Mr. Glascock explained they were looking at an additional six feet of right-of-way on the east side and an additional four feet on the west. Using the overhead, he showed the cross section with a 28 foot pavement and a drawing which illustrated the new right-of-way lines in comparison to the old right-of-way lines. He pointed to some circles on the slide and noted those were the trees they were saving. He stated they were trying to save all the vegetation they could. He pointed out the bulbouts for the rain gardens as well.

Using the diagram on the overhead, Ms. Hoppe asked if the line of trees on her left were being saved. Mr. Glascock pointed to two he thought were being saved and stated he was not sure about the other one. He noted they were trying to save the larger specimens.

Ms. Crayton understood the people that lived on the street parked their cars in their driveways. She noted the street was small and people who did not live there would be parking on both sides of the small street. She understood the street would have curb and gutter and a five foot sidewalk. She thought they should require parking on just one side of the street. She commented that the neighbors were agreeable to the drainage system and the curb and gutter being put it, but wanted the sidewalk removed because some would lose part of their yards. She questioned whether traffic would pick up on the block or if this was for the people that lived on the block. She noted the pedestrians would be at one lady's door if the sidewalk was put in. She stated it would be hard for a fire truck to get down the middle of the street with cars parked on both sides as well.

Mr. Janku asked about the right-of-way. Mr. Glascock explained currently it was a 20 foot street. Mr. Janku asked what the change in right-of-way was. Mr. Glascock replied the difference on one side was four feet and the difference on the other side was two feet. Mr. Janku asked what the original width of the right-of-way they were seeking was. Mr. Glascock replied they had not changed the right-of-way width. He explained they looked at the grading limits in regard to where they could save trees. The right-of-way recommendation had not been changed at all. He noted the street was about 20 feet wide today and would be a 28 foot curb and gutter street when built. They would be getting an additional 8 feet of width to allow for parking on one side of the street. In addition, a five foot sidewalk was being proposed on one side with no green space. Ms. Nauser understood the sidewalk was only on one side. Mr. Glascock stated yes and noted it was on the west side.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the 28 foot wide street would allow parking on one side. Mr. Glascock replied they had it set for one side. Mr. Janku understood parking would be on the pervious pavement. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Ms. Hoppe noted the staff report indicated a 28 foot wide street would allow parking on both sides of the street. Mr. Glascock

stated that was the City's standard, but they could allow it on just one side. Ms. Hoppe commented that she thought the goal was to reduce the width and noted the neighbors wanted parking only on one side. She asked what the advantage was to having parking on one side with the same 28 foot width. Mr. Glascock replied the advantage was that it was a standard street. The only thing that was not standard on this section was that they only had one sidewalk. They normally had two, so that was how they narrowed it down. He commented that there was not a standard that would let him go to less than 28 feet. Ms. Hoppe stated she understood the neighbors were interested in having parking on one side and reducing the width of the street. If the street was going to be 28 feet, they might as well have parking on both sides in order to slow down traffic.

Ms. Crayton noted the neighbors used their driveways and the driveways were big enough for their guests.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Amy Foerstel, 503 Hunt Avenue, stated they wanted a 24 foot wide street with parking on one side and no sidewalk. She understood 28 foot was the standard. She commented that she spoke with the Water & Light Department and understood their road was included in a \$1 million project to put utilities underground. This meant the center line of the road could be shifted two feet to the east. She commented that the sidewalk was not necessary. She agreed they had a lot of foot traffic, but wondered how much they wanted to encourage walking if they were going to widen the street since there would be a lot of road traffic. She agreed she was speaking for her own interest because she could lose half of her front yard. It was 30 feet from the front of her house to the street. If this project was done as proposed she would be losing half of her yard. She would have 10 feet of front yard and 5 feet of sidewalk and it put people closer to her house. She did not believe they needed this elaborate design. They only needed a good road with good drainage all of the way down to I-70. She did not think they needed parking on both sides as they hardly parked on the road. She thought some of the money should go toward another road.

Mary Zieha, 1315 St. Christopher Street, stated the three gentlemen she spoke for last time had met with staff and their Council Representative and were in favor of what Ms. Foerstel wanted. They felt the 5 foot sidewalk was not needed. They also felt having this wide space for one block did not go with the neighborhood. She stated this was a core of working people who owned their homes and had an interest in their neighborhood.

Sid Sullivan, 2980 Maple Bluff Drive, stated a newspaper article indicating the City planned to spend over \$500,000 on a road in one of the older neighborhoods where there was affordable housing caught his attention. It appeared the proposal was driven by the need for a drainage ditch. Even though the road was being widened to a standard, he noted there were other standards required, such as a setback for housing from the roadway. In older neighborhoods, the right-of-way did not allow the setback to take place. He explained Hunt ran parallel to Clinkscapes and understood Clinkscapes had a traffic volume of about 5,000 cars per day, while Hunt had a maximum of about 400. He did not think it made a lot of sense to widen the road to the standard. He commented that he had two problems with this. One was the policy issue of keeping traffic out of neighborhoods. Building a wider road would attract traffic to a quiet neighborhood and the sidewalks really were not needed

because people could walk on the street without being hindered in by traffic coming down the street. He noted sidewalks were needed on Worley and Ash because there were kids and elderly people walking there. He recommended the sidewalk money be spent where they were needed. He noted if they blocked off the street after Patsy they would almost have a cul-de-sac and could provide protection to the neighborhood as it would not encourage traffic down Hunt Street as a short cut to I-70. He understood in the near future I-70 would be improved and a lot of right-of-way would be lost if there was not a bypass for Columbia as the number of lanes would increase on I-70 from four to eight. He stated he was against the proposed plan of widening the street and adding a sidewalk because they would be taking away setbacks and placing the public just a few feet from people's living rooms or bedrooms.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Janku asked if it was possible to move the right-of-way two feet in one direction. Mr. Glascock replied they would not want to move it to the east because that was where the electric lines sat. He noted he spoke with Mr. Dasho who indicated there were no plans to put those lines underground.

Ms. Nauser asked how this street was chosen. Mr. Janku replied they asked for a list of streets and staff suggested Hunt along with a couple others. He noted it clearly needed improvement as it was not up to standard. The list of streets provided were those that were CDBG eligible, but outside the core of downtown as those had been done.

Ms. Crayton noted Hunt Street was not as busy as Fourth and Forrest Streets. She pointed out the neighbors were willing to compromise on the curb and gutter. She did not think parking on the street was necessary. She asked if the standard indicated they had to have sidewalks. She wondered if they could just have curb and gutter. Mayor Hindman understood a 28 foot street was the minimum per the standards. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He noted they were also trying to do porous pavement with the storm drainage, which they normally did not do. He explained they were not putting in pipe connected with drop inlets. They were trying to let it percolate through the pavement, which took up some additional area. It was also under the sidewalk, so if they removed the sidewalk or narrowed the pavement, it would compromise the storm drainage, which might cause them to have to put in pipe instead of the porous pavement.

Mr. Skala stated he was on the Street Standards Committee and agreed 28 foot was the minimum standard, but thought one of the beauties of the document was that it also provided flexibility under certain circumstances, such as in the Stewart Road neighborhood where there were narrow streets. He asked if this could be possible a candidate for a 24 foot wide street.

Ms. Hoppe commented that when she was on the Street Standards Committee, she was concerned about that and noted they were essentially looking at standards for new streets. She understood streets could be retrofitted if the environment/neighborhood was conducive to it, but did not believe it was mandated. She was concerned with making a road in a neighborhood worse than it already was. She thought this street might have been picked over others because of the Water & Light Department identifying this as an area where they needed to create an electric loop, so there was other activity planned for this street. She stated they were using the CDBG funds to improve the neighborhood for the people who

lived there, so she was concerned about imposing this on them. She agreed there were some great advantages with regard to storm water, which was why she wanted the street to be improved, but she did not want to impose something the neighbors saw as a detriment. She thought they should make some accommodations since this was an old existing street.

Ms. Crayton commented that she thought it was nice of the neighbors to discuss this with them. One gentleman indicated he had lived there for 40 years and there had never been a lot of traffic on the road.

Mr. Janku asked if they would agree to a 24 foot street with a sidewalk on one side. Ms. Crayton stated she did not know. She did not think they wanted the sidewalk.

Mayor Hindman asked if the sidewalk could be on the street side of the trees in order to save the trees if they made it a 24 foot street. Mr. Skala replied it was on the street side already. Mr. Janku stated there was no gap between the street and the sidewalk.

Mr. Wade understood the sidewalk was an integral part of the storm water management system built into the street. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct and noted the parking area with the porous pavement was also an integral part. Mr. Wade asked if the design would work in terms of storm water management with a 24 foot standard and a sidewalk. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. He would have to check into that. He explained they would not want to be traveling on the porous pavement. Mr. Wade thought if it was 24 feet, it would be a travel way.

Mayor Hindman asked how wide the driving lanes were. Mr. Glascock replied ten feet.

Ms. Nauser asked if there would be a huge cost differential if they built a standard road without the porous pavement. Mr. Glascock replied there might be some cost savings, but that would be eaten up with pipe and inlets. Ms. Nauser asked if the two would be similar in cost if they reduced it to a 24 foot standard as opposed to the 28 foot standard with the porous pavement, etc. Mr. Glascock replied it was hard to say, but thought it might be close.

Mr. Wade stated he understood there was general support for this at the interested party meeting. He wondered what had happened in the interim.

Mayor Hindman commented that since the neighbors did not appear to want this, they might want to look for another street. Mr. Watkins stated a long list had been given to the Council two years ago and this street was picked out. He did not think they wanted to spend \$500,000 on a street no one wanted.

Ms. Crayton noted they needed the drainage and curb and gutters, but did not need the sidewalk. She thought the neighbors had the right to indicate what they wanted without having to take it all or have nothing.

Mr. Wade understood there was an interested parties meeting where there was strong support and now there was opposition. He wondered what had happened. Ms. Crayton replied she did not think anything had happened. They did not want the sidewalk because they would lose some of their yard. They understood they needed the curb and gutter because their yards were eroding. Mr. Janku noted there were many ways to address storm water run off without redoing the street. He thought they might want to look at a storm water project instead of a street project.

Ms. Hoppe stated in terms of the interested parties meeting, 10 of the 29 abutting property owners were present, so a majority did not attend. Mr. Wade pointed out they were

only hearing from six or seven here. Mr. Janku noted 10 people might be surprised that the Council did not approve the plan.

Mr. Skala understood they were talking about a 28 foot street with the works and some people in opposition, the possibility of a 24 foot street with a sidewalk or moving on to another candidate. Mr. Watkins pointed out the storm water issue would require them to redesign. Mr. Janku understood they could ask staff to look at the storm water issue to determine if there was a way to address it at a modest price.

Ms. Foerstel thought there had to be some type of compromise. She did not believe they could just take it away.

Ms. Hoppe understood they wanted the improvements, but also wanted a narrower street. Mayor Hindman stated they wanted 24 feet with a sidewalk. He suggested they have staff to look at 24 feet with a sidewalk to determine what that would entail. Mr. Glascock asked if they could table it for a month if they decided to do that. Mr. Wade stated he was hearing 24 foot without a sidewalk.

Ms. Foerstel asked if the sidewalk was necessary for the drainage. Mr. Watkins replied that without the sidewalk, they would have to redesign the project going back to a more standard culvert type drainage system. Mr. Skala asked if that was a possibility. Mr. Watkins pointed out it was a total redesign. Mr. Skala understood that was very expensive.

Mr. Janku stated he was supportive of the sidewalk since it was next to a school. Mr. Watkins noted per Council policy, this should have a sidewalk. They had already accommodated it being narrower by putting in only one sidewalk. He also pointed out staff was designing to a set standard. Mr. Skala recalled along with the standard were other options, but those options were supposed to be announced before the design phase so they could be taken into consideration. In this case, it did not happen that way.

Mayor Hindman made the motion to table Item B to the December 3, 2007 Council meeting to allow staff to look at the 24 foot street with a sidewalk. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Ms. Nauser noted they needed to take into account that they were not just building for today, but for the future and it had been their policy to require sidewalks everywhere.

Mr. Janku noted they needed to make a decision because this could impact the required CDBG spend down. He asked staff to provide the list of other streets they could be looking at in case there was still not a strong interest.

Mayor Hindman pointed out they were not asking staff to redesign it. They only wanted additional information.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Janku to table this issue to the December 3, 2007 Council meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B344-07 Approving the Lot 7A North Woods Plat 1 C-P Development Plan located on the northeast corner of Rangeline Street (State Route 763) and American Parkway.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this proposed development, located in north Columbia, would allow for approximately 6,500 square feet of retail space and 3,900 square feet of restaurant space. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the plan.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

Chad Sayre of Allstate Consultants stated he was available for questions.

There being no further comment, Mayor Hindman closed the public hearing.

B344-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B347-07 Authorizing construction of water mains serving Crosscreek Center, Plat 1 (Phase 1); providing for payment of differential costs.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this was a public hearing for a standard water differential project. The City would pay the difference in cost between a 12 inch and 8 inch main.

Ms. Hoppe understood the City normally required a 12 inch rather than an 8 inch to serve future development and asked where the development would be. Mr. Dasho replied in terms of long range plans for the area, he thought there might be further development as Stadium and Lemone Boulevard changed and future planning indicated a 12 inch would be the best thing for the area although an 8 inch would serve the development in question. Ms. Hoppe understood there might or might not be development down the road that would be served by this. Mr. Dasho stated he could not guarantee there would be further development out there, but from what they had seen, this would be a good place to put in an additional sized line.

Mayor Hindman opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Hindman closed the public hearing.

B347-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B346-07 Authorizing an agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for engineering services for design or feasibility studies or both for nine trails including a bikeway from MU to Rock Bridge Elementary School; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this would authorize an agreement with non-motorized funds for both the design and feasibility for nine trails. The contract was in the amount of \$697,612. It included the design of a major backbone trail from MU south to Rockbridge Elementary School paralleling Providence Road and had been approved by MoDOT. They were doing some of the planning on this trail as they rebuilt the bridge over Hinkson Creek and as they picked up the right-of-way from MoDOT. Much of this, including the road in front of Rockbridge High School and the Career Center, was a MoDOT road. Later on the agenda was a proposal to make this a City street. They would also use that right-of-way for the trail.

Ms. Hoppe asked if there would be a trail from Stadium down Providence. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know if it would start at Stadium. He thought it might come out by the Hospital. He did not know if it would cross right at Providence and Stadium.

Mr. Wade commented that he found the map unusable in figuring out which trails they were talking about. Mr. Glascock explained this map was provided because he wanted to show the Council how it fit into the overall plan.

B346-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B353-07 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to conflicts of interest rules for several city commissions.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins stated this was requested by the Council and would amend the current conflict of interest statutes with regard to the three commissions with funding recommendations. Those were the Community Services Commission, Cultural Affairs Commission and Community Development Commission. The change was to treat each school within the Columbia Public School District as a separate agency.

B353-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B354-07 Amending Chapter 16 of the City Code to add a new section on engine brakes.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained this legislation was directed by Council and would prohibit the use of engine brakes, sometimes called Jake brakes, within the City. He noted there was an exception for fire trucks.

Ms. Nauser asked how many complaints they had received regarding this issue. Mr. Boeckmann replied the Police Department indicated they did not receive complaints on it. He understood some Council Members had. Mr. Watkins stated he was unaware of any formal complaints to City staff.

Jack Chick, 1606 Kathy Drive, stated he had been a commercial trucker and satellite engineer so he traveled on the roads a lot. In addition, his house backed up to I-70 Drive. He explained most people did not realize the excessive noise they heard was from a Jake brake. He understood most believed it was from down shifting, but it was not. He commented that the truckers that went through this town were too lazy to put their foot on the brake and flipped a switch to put a Jake brake on instead. He noted if the exhaust system on a big truck was not efficient, it would blow out of the side, which was what they heard every night around 2:00 a.m. or 3:00 a.m. He explained Jake brakes were for decelerating down a long hill to save your brakes. He noted all of his neighbors were for this. They just thought it was just part of living next to I-70, which it was not. He pointed out they also used them coming down the hill on Rangeline. He suggested putting up signs coming into the City. Most truckers did not want a \$500 or \$1,000 fine. He did not think it would need to be enforced as he believed 95 percent would abide by it.

Ms. Nauser asked how long he had lived next to the highway. Mr. Chick replied four years.

Ms. Nauser believed they would be passing an ordinance that was not going to be enforced. She noted the recent shootings and stated the Police Department had more pressing concerns. Although she understood the noise issue, she felt people made a conscience decision in regard to there being noise when buying a home next to a highway. She noted she had lived on Doris Drive near the exit ramp of Highway 70 with the noise. She thought they were passing an ordinance where they would catch some people every once in a while.

Ms. Hoppe noted a comment was made indicating 95 percent of the truckers would see the sign and comply with it, so she did not believe they were expecting this to be a burden on the Police Department. She stated a reason to have rules was because most people followed them. She thought they would see a productive reduction of unnecessary noise.

Mr. Wade stated he was surprised there was no Jake brake ordinance already because they created a level of noise that was unnecessary. He understood hundreds of communities had it for the purpose of eliminating noise.

Mr. Skala stated he purchased his property one-half mile from the highway and it was getting increasingly noisy with the trees being knocked down for development. He believed the Jake brake issue was a real problem when the terrain was hilly, but not to the extent the Jake brakes were necessary. He agreed some of trucks used them when going up and down the hills and it involved a very high level of noise. He thought after improving I-70, they would have to have some noise abatement because they were losing some of the buffering materials between the highways and residential areas. He did not believe the issue was enforcement and did not think it would occupy the Police Department too much.

B354-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B355-07 Approving a settlement agreement with Verizon Wireless; assigning a percentage of the settlement proceeds to the Missouri Municipal League.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Watkins explained a number of cities had filed suit against six cell phone companies for back taxes. They had reached a settlement agreement with the first one, Verizon. They received a letter from the Municipal League today indicating they had reached a settlement agreement with another one, which was the smallest of the six and would have little impact in terms of dollars. They were recommending the Council accept the settlement and contract with the Municipal League for five percent of the settlement as he thought it made sense for them to have money to take some of these things on.

Mr. Janku stated the Municipal League was a very effective advocate on the City's behalf with the General Assembly and he planned to support this.

Mayor Hindman pointed out they essentially got the City this money. Mr. Watkins agreed.

B355-07 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

The following bills were given second reading and the resolutions were read by the Clerk.

- B345-07** Changing the name of "Woody Lane" to "Woodard Drive".
- B348-07** Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B349-07** Authorizing Supplemental Agreement No. 1 with HNTB Corporation for engineering services for the design of the Hinkson Creek Trail between the Grindstone Nature Area and Stephens Lake Park.
- B350-07** Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Public Safety for a Title V Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant; authorizing subgrant agreements with Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Boone County, Inc., the Columbia Housing Authority of the City of Columbia and Rainbow House; appropriating funds.
- B351-07** Appropriating funds for the Share the Light Program.
- B352-07** Accepting the FY 2006 Missouri State Homeland Security Grant Program; authorizing a grant agreement; appropriating funds.
- R248-07** Setting a public hearing: construction of the Chateau Road extension project.
- R249-07** Setting a public hearing: replacement of two restroom buildings at the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.
- R250-07** Setting a public hearing: replacement of a picnic shelter and restroom building at Cosmo-Bethel Park.
- R251-07** Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements to the Park Management Center facility located in the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.
- R252-07** Authorizing Amendment No. 4 to the agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the WIC Supplemental Food Program.
- R253-07** Authorizing a memorandum of agreement with the Cooper County Public Health Department relating to emergency planning and preparedness services.
- R254-07** Authorizing a grant award agreement with The Missouri Foundation for Health for the healthy and active communities project.
- R255-07** Accepting a grant from The Missouri Foundation for Health for Local Health Department Infrastructure Enhancement; authorizing a grant agreement.
- R256-07** Authorizing Adopt A Spot agreements.
- R257-07** Authorizing application to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for a State Revolving Fund loan under the Missouri Clean Water Law for the Clear Creek Pump Station & Force Main Upgrade sanitary sewer improvement project.

- R258-07 Authorizing application for a Land and Water Conservation Fund grant from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources relating to development of the Stephens Lake Park aquatic gardens.
- R259-07 Authorizing an extension for the lease of parking facilities with First Christian Church of Columbia, Missouri.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: WADE, NAUSER, HOPPE, HINDMAN, CRAYTON, JANKU, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.

- PR260-07 Adopting the Bonne Femme Watershed Plan.
- B356-07 Rezoning property located on the north side of Locust Street, between Hitt Street and Waugh Street (1109 Locust Street), from R-3 to C-P; approving lesser building setbacks, lesser parking requirements and less stringent screening requirements.
- B357-07 Approving the Final Plat of Hunter and Lucas Addition Plat Two, a Replat of Lot One of Hunter and Lucas Addition; located on the northwest side of Hinkson Creek Road; granting variances to the Subdivision Regulations.
- B358-07 Changing the name of "Fellows Place" to "Stadium Place".
- B359-07 Authorizing Safe Routes to School Program Agreements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission.
- B360-07 Vacating a drainage easement located within Madison Park Plat 1; accepting a conveyance for drainage purposes.
- B361-07 Vacating a sanitary sewer easement located within Madison Park Plat 1; accepting a conveyance for sewer purposes.
- B362-07 Authorizing construction of the Chateau Road extension project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B363-07 Authorizing the City Manager to apply to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration for airport capital assistance grants.
- B364-07 Authorizing a right of use permit with Woodland Hills Properties, LLC for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of landscaping, including an irrigation system, lighting, electrical conduits and water service lines, within Frontgate Drive right-of-way.
- B365-07 Authorizing a right of use permit with Fairway Meadows Corporation for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of landscaping, including an irrigation system, lighting, electrical conduits and water service lines, within Duckhorn Way, Fitz Court and Ivanhoe Boulevard rights-of-way.

- B366-07 Authorizing a right of use permit with Delta Roads Development Corporation for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a balcony to extend within the right-of-way from the building located at 904 E. Broadway.
- B367-07 Authorizing a right of use permit with Old Hawthorne Community Association, Inc. for construction and placement of customized street naming signs located in the public rights-of-way located within the Old Hawthorne subdivision.
- B368-07 Accepting conveyances for scenic conservation and temporary access purposes.
- B369-07 Authorizing Change Order No. 1 to the contract with Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. for construction of water mains along Holly Avenue from Parker Street to Oakland Gravel Road and Oakland Gravel Road from Paris Road to Grace Ellen Drive.
- B370-07 Authorizing Change Order No. 1 to the contract with Emery Sapp & Sons, Inc. for construction of the Hillsdale Pump Station and 24-inch discharge main under I-70.
- B371-07 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B372-07 Authorizing replacement of two restroom buildings at the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B373-07 Authorizing replacement of a picnic shelter and restroom building at Cosmo-Bethel Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B374-07 Authorizing construction of improvements to the Park Management Center facility located in the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.
- B375-07 Accepting a Trim II Grant from the Missouri Department of Conservation; appropriating funds.
- B376-07 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to the composition of the Board of Health.
- B377-07 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County for Joint Communications clerical services.
- B378-07 Accepting a donation from the Stafford Family Trust through the Columbia Police Foundation to be used by the Police Department in a proactive auto theft program (Bait Car Program); appropriating funds.
- B379-07 Adopting the City of Columbia 2008 Employee Medical Plan; establishing new group insurance premiums for the retiree health and dental care plans.
- B380-07 Amending Chapter 24 of the City Code to add a new section on use of alleys for primary access to buildings or units of buildings.
- B381-07 Confirming the contract with GBH Construction for construction of Fire Station No. 7 located at the northeast corner of Green Meadows Road and Green Meadows Circle; appropriating funds.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

(A) Intra-departmental Transfer of Funds.

Report accepted.

(B) Leadership Program for Community Members.

Mr. Watkins explained staff was asking if this was what Council had in mind and if they wanted to look at such a program.

Mr. Wade stated it appeared they were trying to combine two things that might need to be kept separate. One was training committee and commission members on how to make the committees and commissions more effective and the other was leadership training. He noted he liked the outline for the content of the leadership training, but wondered if they needed to think about workshops for committees and commissions members with regard to Roberts Rules, how to organize work and how to build research capability. He thought they needed to provide specific tools for effective committees and commissions. Providing broad exposure to the community of opportunities for volunteering on committees and commissions was separate. This was a good civic leadership skill item, but there were a couple things it did not do.

Mayor Hindman suggested he meet with Mr. Watkins to discuss his ideas.

Mr. Skala stated he concurred with Mr. Wade as there were two different groups with different skill sets they needed to pay attention to. They also needed to ensure there were multiple opportunities. He thought there needed to be limits on some of the programs, but felt there should be multiple programs so people understood there would be chances for them to get involved.

Mr. Janku thought they were saying one might be for people interested in applying for a board or commission or running for City Council and another would be for people once they were appointed so they would know how to be a good committee member.

Mr. Wade asked if the rest of the Council would be comfortable if he worked with Mr. Watkins. Mayor Hindman suggested a report come out of their meeting, so Council could then deal with it. Mr. Wade was agreeable.

(C) Salt Dome Facility Office Building.

Mr. Watkins stated they were asking the Council to approve a temporary trailer they received from FEMA. The salt building was complete and loaded with salt, but they needed a place in the winter to use as a restroom, etc. for the snow plow operators.

Mayor Hindman made the motion to allow the FEMA temporary trailer at the salt storage facility. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(D) Relinquishment of MoDOT Controlled Streets.

Mr. Watkins explained staff had been discussing this issue with Council for a number of months. In March, a list of streets staff and MoDOT had agreed upon was provided to Council and staff was asked to ensure the streets were in good shape. There were some that needed work. Staff was now satisfied the streets were in a reasonable condition and was requesting Council direction to proceed with relinquishment of those streets.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to bring forward legislation as recommended in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade.

Ms. Nauser asked if staff knew of the costs involved as some indicated a need for additional equipment. Mr. Watkins replied they would provide that. It had been included in the earlier report. Ms. Nauser understood that would need to be considered in next year's budget. Mr. Watkins stated it would and noted it would involve additional maintenance costs.

The motion made by Mr. Janku and seconded by Mr. Wade was approved unanimously by voice vote.

(E) Alternatives for Street Name Signs.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was informational.

(F) Special Business District Refuse Dumpster Issue.

Mayor Hindman understood this report was informational.

(G) Lemone Boulevard Extension - Supplemental Report.

Mr. Watkins explained this report was suggesting a change in the routing of the Lemone Extension, which Council had previously directed staff to proceed with. Since the change was somewhat significant, staff was proposing Council set a public hearing before making a decision on the alignment.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to set a public hearing in regard to the change in the alignment of the Lemone Extension project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mr. Skala stated when he was involved with TARRIF and spoke at the public hearing in regard to this issue, part of this new alignment was part of his argument. It dealt with creating another access for safety purposes. He commented that he was in favor of setting up the hearing for discussion as he felt this was an improvement. He noted, for the future, unless he could be convinced otherwise, he believed any extension over the north and south forks of the Grindstone Creek was a mistake.

Ms. Hoppe stated she believed this was an improvement. She understood the residents that spoke were advocating this area without the bridges. She reiterated she agreed this configuration with a second outlet was an improvement.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Janku was approved unanimously by voice vote.

(H) Columbia Transit Service to the Forum Boulevard Area.

Mayor Hindman noted this report was informational.

(I) Subdividing Beats.

Mr. Watkins explained Council requested information on how police beats were manned and how the number of officers assigned to each beat was determined. This report provided an in-depth analysis.

Mayor Hindman felt, as general rule, the Council should not be trying to decide what the beats should look like, but thought it was nice to have this information.

(J) Internal Affairs Assessment - 2nd Progress Report.

Mayor Hindman understood this was a progress report and no action was required.

(K) Street Lights on Brown School Road.

Mr. Watkins noted this was a request by Boone Electric for Council to change the wattage of the street lighting fixtures.

Mr. Skala understood this would be consistent with what the City used. Mr. Watkins stated yes. Mayor Hindman understood the County used much brighter lights. Mr. Watkins explained they used 400 watts and the City used 250 watts. They would put in 250 watt bulbs if that was what Council directed. Mr. Wade understood it saved the City some money.

Mr. Janku made the motion to allow Boone Electric to install 250 watt fixtures on Brown School Road. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(L) Street Lighting Fixture Alternatives Forum Boulevard.

Mr. Watkins noted there had been ongoing discussions on how to best provide street lighting on Forum Boulevard. Mr. Dasho had photographs showing a potential third type of fixture that could be an alternative for the median area along Forum Boulevard.

Mr. Dasho explained they looked at a number of options and one had a long pole of about 35 feet that could have different lengths of fixtures attached to it. One discussed was a fixture close to the pole similar to what was seen in the photograph on the overhead, which was associated with parking lights. It was a different looking fixture than what was put on the arterials and collectors, but was an alternative to one provided in the report. He noted the report provided fixtures that were more consistent with the boulevard/neighborhood environment they were trying to address on Forum. This was one of the more neighborhood compatible fixtures. He explained the difficulty with these and any other fixtures that were unique in design was the cost. The pole and fixture would cost about \$5,500 more than what they were purchasing now. He showed another fixture on the overhead, which had a more modern look, and noted it would cost about the same as what they installed now, which was approximately \$1,000 per fixture.

Mayor Hindman felt the City could not pay that for a particular neighborhood.

Ms. Nauser stated she was little upset. She explained costs were never given to her at the meeting that was held. She noted she would have never suggested bringing any type of light pole that had a cost of almost five times that of a regular light pole forward for Council approval, which was what this report suggested. She thought they needed to go back to the drawing board. She noted they were provided two options at the meeting held and when she left the meeting, she thought everything was fine and they would be moving forward. She stated it would have been nice to have been provided the cost in advance, so she could have pulled this report off of the agenda before it was published. She felt they could find something that was comparable in a book with thousands of light fixtures. She pointed out they also discussed bringing forth some kind of policy that would accommodate certain types of situations, such as boulevards that were heavily landscaped and future developments with different types of light poles, but that was not in the report. She stated she was not just trying to get one section of town nice, pretty light poles. She wanted an overarching policy that

addressed situations like this for the future. She reiterated she wanted staff to go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Skala stated he anticipated quite a bit of money for decorative lamps because he spent some time looking at luminaires and thought they might be able to find what Ms. Nauser was looking for at a more reasonable price, but was not sure. He commented that they referred this issue to the Environment and Energy Commission since they were also looking at street lighting. He believed the issues they needed to focus on were safety and efficiency with regard to street lighting. He stated the ornamental or esthetic component was a candidate when they wanted to spruce up the roadway, but he thought they needed to have another way to fund something like that if they decided to make that an option. If they decided to restrict ornamental lighting to boulevards or landscaped parkways, they might receive more applications for those. Unless it was elective and they had some way to pay for them, he felt they needed to focus on the areas of safety and efficiency.

Mr. Janku stated he agreed with Mr. Skala in that there would be a wide spread request for these and the City's standards would evolve as people requested it be broadened. He noted the deluxe master one was used in Jefferson City if they wanted to see it.

Ms. Nauser commented that the policy they discussed for new lighting would involve non-commercial boulevards running through neighborhoods. They were not asking for things to be retrofitted. They discussed providing options in commercial areas if someone wanted to contribute toward it. She understood there would be a greater cost, but did not think it would be \$88,000. She noted this had been going on since August and did not believe her request was a difficult one. She asked for staff to review this issue one more time and to provide her options with the associated costs. If there was nothing, she would accept that, but she wanted to see options.

Mayor Hindman noted there would be a many vendors of these lights at the National League of Cities and suggested she talk to them. Ms. Nauser stated she would do that.

Mr. Wade stated they looked at catalogs and Luxmasters was in Columbia, which was where he received the idea to suggest this as a possibility initially. He understood they were in the parking lots in the commercial development at Chapel Hill and Forum Boulevard.

(M) Providence Road Corridor Plan Update.

Mr. Janku stated he suggested they look at this a couple years ago and part of the reason was because there were some rezoning requests on Providence Road, which were changes from the previous land use plan, so they had issues such as driveway access, property distance from the street, etc. He thought they needed to discuss this before asking any stakeholders group to review it.

Mr. Skala noted he was on a subcommittee of the Planning and Zoning Commission at the request of Council to look at this issue, so he thought there was some degree of expertise on the current Planning and Zoning Commission that might be able to help with this discussion. He thought it might also be helpful to look at the work that had already been done.

(N) Hickman Pool Improvements.

Mayor Hindman stated the recommendation was to let staff know if the Council wanted them to continue working with the School District. He thought they would. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to continue working with the School District in regard to the Hickman Pool improvements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Hindman made a motion for Council to adopt the list of people he recommended for appointment to the Committee for Review of Citizen Oversight of the Police Department. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the work Mayor Hindman put into developing this list. He explained Mayor Hindman had asked for input from the Council, which he thought was important, so he reviewed the applicants and provided a list of people he strongly supported. He understood a Chair for this Committee had been identified and his credentials were impeccable. He was hopeful, in the future, when these special task forces or committee were formed that everyone, including the officers, be required to submit an application so they could all be reviewed. He noted he appreciated the work that had been done and thought it was a very good list.

Mayor Hindman explained when it was advertised, they had made it clear it would not be restricted to the applicants. The reason for doing that was to ensure they had a true cross section because sometimes when being restricted to a particular list of applicants, that did not happen. He noted nearly everyone recommended for appointment made an application.

The motion made by Mayor Hindman and seconded by Mr. Janku was approved unanimously by voice vote.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Skala stated he wanted to refer the issue of land disturbance, particularly with regard ideas for steep slopes, to the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) and request a report. He understood there might be comments from the Visioning Group with regard to this and noted the Council had a work session scheduled regarding land disturbance and steep slopes. He thought the EEC could be working on this in parallel with what they and others were doing.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing the Energy and Environment Commission to review the issue of land disturbance and steep slopes and to provide a report to the Council. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Wade asked if staff was also doing something regarding the issue.

Mr. Dasho stated the Water & Light Department staff was the liaison for this Commission and asked for clarification on what was being requested to be included in the report. Mr. Skala explained he understood there were sample “steep slope” ordinances with regard to land disturbance. Before he was elected to the Council, he had been working on land disturbance issues as a member of the Environment and Energy Commission with regard to the discretion the Director of Public Works had to protect some of the topography

on behalf of the citizens. He spoke with Mr. Glascock at that time and was told he did not have a lot of discretion as long as the people who asked for the permits satisfied certain criteria. In reading the ordinances, it was not clear to him that was iron clad. He thought they should add the issue of the steep slope to that so they would have the information when they had their work session. Mr. Dasho understood he was looking for a discussion of both the existing ordinances and what could be done in terms of land disturbance on steep slopes. Mr. Skala stated that was correct and noted the land disturbance that occurred at the end of Stadium generated this idea.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Ms. Hoppe was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala noted he received a letter from the Disabilities Commission concerning ADA compliance with some new commercial spaces, primarily with regard to the balcony at Quinton's, and wondered if they could receive a staff report.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide a report regarding ADA compliance for the new commercial spaces to include how it was enforced if it was not up to Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku.

Mayor Hindman understood something like that could be handled by filing an ordinary complaint as well.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Janku was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated his Third Ward office hours at the Coffee Ground would be cancelled for November 17, 2007 because he would be at the NLC meeting. He also reminded everyone to vote tomorrow.

Mr. Wade stated he would not be having office hours on Saturday, November 17, 2007 either as he would also be attending the NLC conference.

Ms. Nauser understood the Central Missouri Humane Society would be charging drop off fees to people bringing them animals. An editorial in the paper indicated it was the government's responsibility to ensure there was adequate funding to take care of the animals. She noted society was judged by how they took care of their elders, children and animals. She agreed the government might have a responsibility to ensure there was adequate funding to take care of animals and to encourage people to bring animals to the Humane Society instead of dumping them somewhere. She stated she would like a report regarding the status of the City's animal control facilities. She wondered what shape it was in and what the costs for the future were. She also wanted them to consider providing a couple thousand dollars from Council reserve funds so the \$20 drop off fee could be waived during the winter. She commented that she did not know the system, so it might be something they could not do. She noted that was the part she thought might be the government's responsibility. She pointed out she also planned to personally campaign to raise money for the Humane Society and was hopeful people could find it in their hearts to contribute.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to provide a status of the City's animal control facilities to include the shape it was in and the potential future costs. She also wanted the Council to consider the possibility of using some of the Council reserve funds to address this issue.

Ms. Hoppe suggested they look at using the money to waive the fee for individuals that needed it. Ms. Nauser agreed they might want to come up with criteria.

Mayor Hindman asked if Ms. Nauser would like the report first so the Council understood how much might be needed. Ms. Nauser replied having the report only at this time would be fine. She noted it could cost the City more in the long run if the animal control officers had to pick up more animals.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser was seconded by Mayor Hindman and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser understood this was outside the City's jurisdiction, but wondered if the City could ask MoDOT to stripe some of the roads. She noted she had been driving at night during inclement weather on Stadium and could not see the road. On Sinclair Road, there were no stripes, reflectors or lights.

Mr. Skala stated he had heard these same complaints.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to contact MoDOT regarding the issue of striping streets under their jurisdiction and to work with the County with regard to Sinclair for striping or reflective stickers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Crayton reminded everyone about "Everyone Eats" and noted they would be delivering some baskets this week. She also invited people to help on Thanksgiving Day event, which would be held in the Stephens College Ballroom this year. She noted anyone who had no place to go was welcome to attend this event because they would have plenty of food.

Mr. Janku explained he had attended an excellent meeting with regard to entryways into the community and understood Rangeline was mentioned. He stated he wanted to know what was planned in terms of landscaping and also if there were any plans associated with the roundabout that was outside the City limits at the north end of Rangline. Mr. Watkins stated he was sure MoDOT did not have any plans to landscape it.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to provide a report in regard to what might be accomplished for Rangeline in terms of landscaping. He wanted to know if MoDOT would be paving it or if they would allow dirt to be put in it. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Janku understood the naming of the alleys was a ways down the road, but the issue of multiple names had been discussed. He knew the Historic Preservation Commission would be bringing forth many recommendations and felt they might have a bias toward having multiple names. He suggested they ask for input from the Planning & Zoning

Commission as well. He thought they discussed that at their meeting when discussing potential names.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing the Planning & Zoning Commission for their thoughts on alleys having multiple names. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman stated he agreed with some of the comments made earlier by Mr. Clark regarding the issue of people who were letting their houses become run down.

Mayor Hindman made a motion directing staff to review the issue and provide a report back with merits and demerits of Mr. Clark's suggestions with regard to people letting their house become run down. The motion was seconded by Mr. Janku and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Hindman stated he thought the meeting he attended in Seattle was very interesting and would be glad to talk to people about it. He noted there was a lot going on with climate issues at the municipal level. He felt there were some real economic development possibilities for Columbia in connection with it. He believed there would be a green economy coming along soon and thought they should get in on it.

Mr. Janku made a motion directing staff to contact MoDOT about placing signs on Highway 63 and I-70 with regard to the Jake brake legislation passed tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wade and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 11:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk